Md.
J.426

SUMMARY

Maryland
HC
107
.M32
no.136
Folio

MARYLAND'S OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN

An Interim Report

Maryland State Planning Department

April 1966

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND LIBRARY

Maryland State Planning Department
1103 State Office Building
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Publication No. 136

Price $1.00

SUMMARY

MARYLAND'S OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN

An Interim Report

State of Maryland

J. Millard Tawes, *Governor*

Publication.

Prepared by

Maryland State Planning Department

James J. O'Donnell, *Director*

Richard A. Gucker, *Chief*, Local Planning

Project Planners

John T. Starr, Jr.
Gerald F. Vaughn

The preparation of this document was financially aided through a Federal grant from the Urban Renewal Administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, under the Urban Planning Assistance Program authorized by Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended.

April 1966

BUREAU OF GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

FOREWORD

This summary presents the highlights of *Maryland's Outdoor Recreation Plan: An Interim Report.* The complete 138-page document (plus appendices) is available for examination in the offices of the State Planning Department, 301 West Preston Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

As the Plan indicates, a program has been formulated that is intended to assure both residents and non-residents of Maryland abundant outdoor recreation opportunities. However, at this time the program must be outlined in general form only, with broad needs identified rather than specific projects. Further compilation and analysis of data are necessary for the detailed refinement of this Plan. The State Planning Department now has underway studies of land use and open space, economic base, water resources, and State policies, scheduled for completion by May 1967. The data and findings from these studies will be employed in the preparation of a more precise revision of the statewide outdoor recreation plan.

To implement the State's outdoor recreation program, full use will be made of Federal, State, and local government sources of funds. In this regard, *Maryland's Outdoor Recreation Plan: An Interim Report* has enabled the State to qualify for approximately $18 million of grants-in-aid during the next ten years from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund, which will be administered through the State Department of Forests and Parks. Maryland's initial eligibility under this program will extend until October 1, 1967, in accordance with the State's schedule for revision of the Plan.

Maryland
HC
107
.M32
no.136
Folio

UNIV. OF MD. COLLEGE PARK
3 1430 00273900 3

UNIV. OF MD. COLLEGE PARK
3 1430 00273900 3

OBJECTIVES

Maryland's Outdoor Recreation Plan and later revisions are intended to serve:

1. As a guide for providing the citizens of the State with broad and varied opportunities for outdoor recreation activities, in the fullest possible range suitable to the geographic, sociologic, and economic factors affecting the State. A principal concern is in planning for anticipated population changes and formulating a program of acquisition, development, and protection which will keep pace with the increasing needs of Maryland's people.
2. To encourage acquisition and development, by State, county, local, or other public bodies, of all available shoreline along Chesapeake Bay capable of recreational use. Few of the Bay's (and its tidal tributaries') 3,200 miles of shoreline now are open to public access. This valuable natural resource should be held inviolate for all the people of the State.
3. To identify and provide recommendations for protecting the features which, at least in their special combination, are unique in Maryland and which are a source of pride to her citizens and delight to her guests. These include unique natural features, the range of agricultural and forest land uses that dominate the Maryland landscape, and a generous sprinkling of reminders of the State's history which is closely interwoven with the early settlement of the Nation and the War of 1812. Insofar as these consist of extensive areas which may be focal points for outdoor recreation, they are properly the subject of this Plan.
4. To identify and recommend a network of scenic roads. The network will contain existing roads which should be protected and, in some locations, improved in appearance or surroundings. The recommendations will include long stretches of regional highways as well as short back roads. In addition, the Plan will indicate general locations where new scenic roads are desirable. Roads will be considered not only as part of the experience of going to recreation areas, but also as furnishing an increasingly popular form of recreation in themselves.
5. To facilitate Maryland's participation in the joint State-Federal program for pollution control, scenic beauty preservation, and provision of outdoor recreation facilities along the Potomac River. It is particularly critical to all Marylanders that the Potomac River, flowing through the Nation's capital, be a watercourse about which America may be justifiably proud.
6. As a framework for action to provide for the expanding number of out-of-state visitors who presently use Maryland's recreation resources, and for those who would do so if more facilities were available. New facilities should be aimed at providing the qualities most desired in the locations where pressure is the greatest. By guiding State action and encouraging local and private initiative, this Plan will aid in broadening Maryland's economic base with respect to tourism. Such activities should provide greater amenities in the environment for living and working in the State,

thus benefiting both present residents and the growth of new business and industry. The Plan will program actions toward this goal to fit expected national and regional trends, and in particular, trends in the southern, mid-Atlantic, and northeastern states, which furnish the majority of non-resident vacationers in Maryland.

7. To instill in all our citizens, especially our children and young people, an appreciation of and concern for the conservation of Maryland's natural resources and the enhancement of our State's scenic beauty. This Plan seeks to enable all Marylanders to experience a renewal of spirit and an opportunity for nature to inspire our daily lives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Plan was prepared by John T. Starr, Jr., and Gerald F. Vaughn, of the State Planning Department. The assistance of the following Department staff members is gratefully acknowledged:

Nancy A. Gunkel (Mrs.)

Eva Land (Mrs.)

Leo A. McManus

Sondra Oglesby (Miss)

Howard Stiefel

Louis C. Violi

Appreciation is further expressed to Edward I. Heath and Harry W. Hunter of the State Department of Forests and Parks who aided the project planners in numerous ways.

In the preparation of this Plan, considerable help was given by several agencies within three Federal departments—Agriculture, Defense, and the Interior. Within the Department of Agriculture (USDA), the following agencies cooperated in this planning effort: Agricultural Conservation and Stabilization Service, Cooperative Extension Service (jointly with the University of Maryland), Farmer's Home Administration, and Soil Conservation Service; county Technical Action Panels (USDA) were also involved in the study. Several officials of the Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense, acted in advisory roles at various stages of the plan preparation. Two agencies within the Department of the Interior were also associated with the study: Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and National Park Service. Each of these agencies was consulted in the data collection phase of the study.

Many State and local agencies also participated in the preparation of the Plan. These agencies include the Department of Forests and Parks, Department of Game and Inland Fish, Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs, Department of Education, State Roads Commission, Department of Mental Hygiene, Interdepartmental Committee on Marine Recreation, Commission on Hunting Spaces, Scenic Beauty Commission, and the Master Plan Committee on State Parks. Each of these agencies is charged with a responsibility for outdoor recreation planning and/or development. They played an important role, particularly in the collection of data for the public sector.

In the gathering of data, the county and municipal governments throughout the State also played integral parts. Similarly, quasi-public organizations having an interest in recreation development (such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, 4-H Clubs, churches, and service clubs) and private recreation enterprises (such as swimming pools and golf courses) gave valuable aid. The cooperation of the various governmental agencies, quasi-public organizations, and private entrepreneurs has assured the State of a well-coordinated Plan which will be effective in meeting the recreation needs of the people of Maryland.

CURRENT SUPPLY OF OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN MARYLAND

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's classification system is given, since this system was utilized in inventorying Maryland's outdoor recreation areas and facilities.

CLASS I

High Density Recreation Areas

PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS

Physiographic features, such as topography, soil type, and drainage, should be adaptable to special types of intensive recreation use and development. An attractive natural setting is desirable; however, man-made settings are acceptable. There are no specific size criteria, and there is great variation in size from one area to another.

LOCATION

Although usually within or near major centers of urban population, these areas may occur within such units as national or state parks and forests remote from population concentrations.

ACTIVITIES

Intensive day or weekend type activities, such as picnicking, water sports, winter sports, group field games, and other activities for many people, are predominant. Although high density areas are subject to heavy peakload pressure at certain times, they often sustain moderate use throughout the year.

DEVELOPMENT

These areas are characterized by a high degree of facility development which often requires heavy investment. They are usually managed exclusively for recreation purposes. Development may include a road network, parking areas, bathing beaches, marinas, bath houses, artificial lakes, playfields, and sanitary and eating facilities.

RESPONSIBILITY

Such areas are commonly held under municipal, county, regional, or State ownership. Many commercial resorts have similar characteristics and collectively provide a significant portion of recreation opportunities for urban population centers.

CLASS II

General Outdoor Recreation Areas

PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS

The areas may have varied topography and interesting flora or fauna within a generally attractive natural or man-made setting adaptable to providing a wide range of opportunities. These areas may range in size from several acres to large tracts of land.

LOCATION

Usually more remote than Class I areas, these areas are relatively accessible to centers of urban population and accommodate a major share of all outdoor recreation. Included are portions of public parks and forests, public and commercial camping sites, picnic grounds, trail areas, ski areas, resorts, streams, lakes, coastal areas, and hunting preserves.

ACTIVITIES

Extensive day, weekend, and vacation use types of activities, such as camping, picnicking, fishing, hunting, water sports, winter sports, nature walks, and outdoor games, are most common.

DEVELOPMENT

Generally less intensive than in Class I areas, development includes but is not limited to access roads, parking areas, picnic areas, campgrounds, bathing beaches, marinas, streams, natural and/or artificial lakes. Areas are equipped with some man-made facilities, which may vary from simple to elaborate. Thus, campgrounds may have only the barest necessities for sanitation and fire control, or they may have ample and carefully planned facilities, such as cabins, hot and cold running water, laundry equipment, stores, museums, small libraries, entertainment, and juvenile and adult playfields. Other features may include permanent tows for ski areas, fully equipped marinas, lodges, dude ranches, and luxury hotels.

RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility is assumed by Federal, State, or local governments, including regional park and recreation authorities, and private clubs and other forms of private ownership assisted by public agencies on problems of access and development of basic facilities.

CLASS III

Natural Environmental Areas

PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS

Physiography should include varied and interesting land forms, lakes, streams, flora, and fauna within attractive natural settings.

LOCATION

Usually more remote from population centers than intensively used areas, Class III areas occur throughout the countryside and on an acreage basis are the largest class in both public and private ownership.

ACTIVITIES

Activities are extensive weekend and vacation types dependent on quality of the natural environment, such as sightseeing, hiking, nature study, picnicking, camping, swimming, boating, canoeing, fishing, hunting, and mountaineering. The primary objective is to provide for traditional recreation experience in the out-of-doors, commonly in conjunction with other resource uses. Users are encouraged to enjoy the resource "as is" in natural environment.

DEVELOPMENT

Access roads, trails, picnic and campsite facilities, and minimum sanitary facilities are typical developments. There may be other compatible uses of the area such as watershed protection, water supply, grazing, lumbering, and mining, provided such activities are managed so as to retain the attractiveness of the natural setting.

RESPONSIBILITY

Federal, State, or local governments, including regional park and recreation authorities and private ownerships, may assume responsibility.

CLASS IV
Outstanding Natural Areas

PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS

Encompassed are outstanding natural features associated with an outdoor environment that merit special attention and care in management to insure their preservation in their natural condition. They include individual areas of remarkable natural wonder, high scenic splendor, or features of scientific importance. One or more such areas may be part of a larger administrative unit, such as a national or state park or forest.

LOCATION

Any place where such features are found is a suitable location.

ACTIVITIES

Sightseeing, enjoyment, and study of the natural features are preferred activities. Kinds and intensity of use are limited to the enjoyment and study of the natural attractions so as to preserve the quality of the natural features and maintain an appropriate setting. They are visited on a day, weekend, or vacation trip.

DEVELOPMENT

These areas are limited to minimum development required for public enjoyment, health, safety, and protection of the features. Wherever possible, access roads and facilities other than trails and sanitary facilities should be kept outside the immediate vicinity of the natural features. Visitors are encouraged to walk to the feature or into the area when feasible. Improvements should harmonize with and not detract from the natural setting.

RESPONSIBILITY

Public agencies (Federal, State, and local) and private landowners, with assistance from public agencies, may identify, set aside, and manage natural features. Generally the Federal Government assumes responsibility for the protection and management of natural areas of national significance; the States, for areas of regional or State significance; and local government and private owners, for areas of primarily local significance.

CLASS V
Primitive Areas

PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS

Extensive natural, wild, and undeveloped settings removed from the sights, sounds, and smells of civilization are considered primitive. Essential char-

acteristics are that the natural environment has not been disturbed by commercial utilization and that the areas are without mechanized transportation routes. The area must be large enough and so located as to give the user the feeling that he is enjoying a "wilderness experience." The site may vary with different physical and biological conditions and may be determined in part by the characteristics of adjacent land. Size may vary in different parts of the Nation. These areas are inspirational, esthetic, scientific, and cultural assets of the highest value.

LOCATION

Primitive areas are usually remote from population centers.

ACTIVITIES

Camping out on one's own without mechanized transportation or permanent shelter or other conveniences is the leading activity.

DEVELOPMENT

No development of public roads, permanent habitations, or recreation facilities except trails is desirable. No mechanized equipment is allowed except that needed to control fire, insects, and disease. Commercial use of the area that may exist at the time of establishment should be discontinued as soon as practicable.

RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility is usually Federal but may also be with State agencies or private landowners (such as the high mountain country held by large timber and mining companies).

CLASS VI

Historic and Cultural Sites

PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS

These are sites associated with the history, tradition, or cultural heritage of National, State, or local interest and are of enough significance to merit preservation or restoration.

LOCATION

The location of the feature establishes the site.

ACTIVITIES

Sightseeing, enjoyment, and study of the historic or cultural features are proper activities. Kinds and intensity of use are limited to this type of study and enjoyment.

DEVELOPMENT

Management should be limited to activities that would effect such preservation and restoration as may be necessary to protect the features from deterioration and to interpret their significance to the public. Access to the area should be adequate but on-site development limited to prevent overuse. Development should not detract from the historic or cultural values of the site.

RESPONSIBILITY

Public agencies (Federal, State, and local) and private landowners may identify, set aside, and manage historic and cultural areas. Quasi-public organizations often assume responsibility for such areas, also.

Table 1

Public Outdoor Recreation Inventory—Maryland Summary

Administering Agencies	Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Classification						*Total Acreage, by Administering Agency*	*Per Cent of Total Acreage, by Administering Agency*
	I	*II*	*III*	*IV*	*V*	*VI*		
				(acres)				
Federal	198	14,242	8,198	450	.....	6,275	29,363	10.1
State	1,255	3,571	190,510	52	2,605	65	198,058	68.3
County	4,398	6,863	4,699	77	.....	12	16,049	5.5
Municipal	2,024	4,960	39,776	.....	.....	3	46,763	16.1
Total Acreage in Each Class	7,875	29,636	243,183	579	2,605	6,355	290,233	100.0
Per Cent of Total Acreage in Each Class	2.7	10.2	83.8	0.2	0.9	2.2	100.0	

Table 2

Public Outdoor Recreation Inventory

Location	Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Classification						
	I	*II*	*III*	*IV*	*V*	*VI*	*Total*
				(acres)			
Baltimore City	793	1,553	2,470	.....	.....	46	4,862
Allegany	87	121	37,591	.....	.....	1,188	38,987
Anne Arundel	268	763	1,894	.....	.....	.....	2,925
Baltimore County	2,483	2,242	23,741	.....	.....	45	28,511
Calvert	2	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	7
Caroline	103	80	700	.....	.....	.....	883
Carroll	87	306	6,569	.....	.....	.....	6,962
Cecil	97	395	4,808	30	.....	.....	5,330
Charles	9	138	4,921	.....	.....	10	5,078
Dorchester	169	185	11,586	.....	.....	.....	11,940
Frederick	562	2,597	14,789	70	1,980	442	20,440
Garrett	323	329	77,824	.....	.....	1	78,477
Harford	445	5,587	1,224	2	.....	10	7,268
Howard	159	850	5,963	.....	.....	.....	6,972
Kent	10	38	561	.....	.....	.....	609
Montgomery	1,076	6,644	5,999	477	.....	1,270	15,466
Prince George's	625	7,224	3,486	.....	.....	177	11,512
Queen Anne's	83	23	179	.....	.....	.....	285
St. Mary's	16	13	78	.....	.....	.....	107
Somerset	18	27	15,562	.....	.....	.....	15,607
Talbot	22	10	.....	.....	.....	2	34
Washington	161	338	6,337	.....	.....	3,152	9,988
Wicomico	208	74	3,239	.....	.....	.....	3,521
Worcester	69	94	13,662	.....	625	12	14,462
Total	7,875	29,636	243,183	579	2,605	6,355	290,233

Table 3—Quasi-Public and Private Outdoor Recreation Land—Maryland Summary

Facility	*Total*	
QUASI-PUBLIC:		
Camps	11,350	acres
Field Sports/Picnic Areas	1,310	"
Historic Sites	2,567	"
Nature Study Areas	20	"
PRIVATE:		
Amateur Athletics	749	"
Horse Racing	1,928	"
Auto Racing	211	"
Amusement Parks	688	"
Beaches	735	"
Swimming Pools	915	"
Ice Skating Rinks	2	"
Fairgrounds/Carnivals	50	"
Boat Rental	93	"
Golf (Driving Range)	358	"
" (Miniature)	35	"
" (Regular)	1,567	"
Country Clubs	9,353	"
Riding Academies	1,571	"
Farm Ponds Open to Public	1,283	"
Commercial Marinas	12,813	slips
Regulated Shooting Areas	11,140	acres
Commercial Campgrounds	311	"
TOTAL	46,236	acres (excluding commercial marinas)

Table 4—Quasi-Public and Private Outdoor Recreation Land

Location	*Total* (acres)
Baltimore City	366
Allegany	733
Anne Arundel	2,598
Baltimore County	6,047
Calvert	1,999
Caroline	654
Carroll	1,213
Cecil	2,377
Charles	1,300
Dorchester	1,611
Frederick	4,281
Garrett	384
Harford	4,263
Howard	1,789
Kent	2,057
Montgomery	6,036
Prince George's	2,387
Queen Anne's	1,594
St. Mary's	536
Somerset	41
Talbot	632
Washington	2,494
Wicomico	274
Worcester	570
TOTAL	46,236

Table 5—Participation in Outdoor Recreation Activities in Maryland, 1964-1965
(Household Survey)

Outdoor Recreation Activity	*Per Cent of Households which Participated*	*Number of Households which Participated*	*Average Number of Participation Occurrences Yearly*	*Total Household Participation Occurrences Yearly*
Driving for pleasure	84.95	648,489	20.64	15,756,748
Walking for pleasure, hiking, nature walks	50.85	338,166	13.70	10,456,458
Golf	15.26	116,512	3.26	2,490,296
Swimming:				
Pool away from home	46.08	351,806	6.61	5,047,944
River	17.80	135,914	2.28	1,739,936
Ocean	41.34	315,626	2.21	1,686,290
Bay	27.85	212,588	1.59	1,215,923
Lake	11.75	89,607	0.79	601,581
Pond	4.19	32,006	0.43	329,279
Other	5.45	41,626	0.67	509,805
Fishing	45.30	345,843	6.21	4,740,783
Picnicking	72.41	552,779	5.29	4,039,738
Hunting	19.84	151,445	2.22	1,694,325
Horseback riding	11.39	86,943	1.43	1,089,206
Camping	14.67	111,952	0.57	431,102
Ice Skating	21.52	164,271	1.45	1,085,465
Snow Skiing	2.48	18,891	0.29	217,650

Table 6—Number of Activity Days per Person 12 Years Old and Over During 1960-1961, by Activity
(Northeast and South Regions)

Outdoor Recreation Activity	Region*	
	Northeast	*South*
Driving for pleasure	21.29	19.63
Walking for pleasure	24.62	14.65
Playing outdoor games or sports	12.31	12.88
Swimming	7.97	5.54
Bicycling	5.38	5.32
Sightseeing	5.11	5.09
Fishing	3.26	5.30
Attending outdoor sports events	3.22	4.18
Picnicking	3.77	2.77
Nature walks	2.79	2.65
Hunting	1.35	2.58
Horseback riding	0.74	1.50
Sledding or tobogganing	1.18	0.28
Camping	0.55	0.79
Ice skating	1.07	0.05
Water skiing	0.32	0.54
Attending outdoor concerts and drama	0.50	0.29
Hiking	0.41	0.35
Canoeing	0.13	0.10
Sailing	0.17	0.04
Other boating	1.77	1.86
Mountain climbing	0.08	0.14
Snow skiing	0.18	0.02
Miscellaneous	0.82	0.24

* Regions are the standard delineation of the U. S. Census Bureau, excepting Alaska and Hawaii.
(*Source: U. S. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission*)

DETERMINATION OF NEEDS

Standards

Because precise demand data for Maryland have not yet been sufficiently analyzed, public outdoor recreation area requirements presented in this Plan were derived by application of nationally recognized standards suggested by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. These standards provide a total of 90 acres of public outdoor recreation land per 1,000 population—65 acres per 1,000 for State areas and 25 acres per 1,000 for city and county areas. This acreage excludes private and quasi-public areas.

For purposes of this Plan, all public areas were considered to be either intensive or extensive in use. Intensive areas are those which are designed for use by large numbers of people daily per unit of land area (such as swimming pools, beaches, golf courses, and playgrounds). Extensive areas receive relatively less use (such as for hunting, hiking, and nature study). Therefore, the inventory data provided in the section on supply and classified according to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation classification system were regrouped as follows:

Classes I and II were considered intensive areas; and

Classes III through VI were considered extensive areas.

The standards employed in this Plan are shown in Table 7 for city areas, county areas, and State areas.

Table 7

Standards for Public Outdoor Recreation Areas

Type of Area	Acres per 1,000 Population
City Administered	10
Intensive use areas	5
Extensive use areas	5
County Administered	15
Intensive use areas	5
Extensive use areas	10
State Administered	65
General recreation areas	15
Hunting and fishing areas	20
Natural areas	30

Since not all of Maryland's population centers are municipalities, city and county needs data are combined. This is necessary since a community which is not incorporated has no legal authority for acquisition and development of recreation land and facilities. For this reason, needs are shown for city-county areas and for State areas, both for intensive use and for extensive use.

Each county requires 25 acres per 1,000 of its population for intensive and extensive use areas to be administered by either the county or cities or towns within the county. However, Baltimore City's limited land area necessitates special adjustments. For this purpose, a portion of Baltimore City's need (specifically the need for 15 acres per 1,000 population for "county" administered areas and 65 acres per 1,000 population for State administered areas) was allocated to each of Maryland's 23 counties. For those counties in the Baltimore region (Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, and Howard), each was allocated 10 per cent of Baltimore City's "county" areas need. In the more distant 18 counties, the remaining 50 per cent of Baltimore City's need was distributed equally. Also, all of Baltimore City's need for State administered areas was distributed similarly among the 23 counties. Of course, Baltimore City's need for 10 acres per 1,000 of its population for city administered intensive and extensive use areas was allocated to the City itself.

Although Maryland surrounds Washington, D. C., in part, no adjustments were provided in this Plan to allow for the needs of District of Columbia residents. Such adjustments were not feasible, in that the District of Columbia does not contribute financially to the acquisition, development, and operation of State and local public outdoor recreation areas in Maryland. Also, the District of Columbia receives a separate allocation from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Time Period for the Plan

The Plan has been prepared for two target dates. The first date is 1965, recognizing that current facilities are not adequate for even today's needs. The second date is 1990, with the Plan designed to serve future needs. As the Plan is revised and refined, it will be possible to estimate recreation demand for the intermediate period.

Table 8

Population of Maryland

1960 - 1990

Location	*Census* 1960	*Estimated* 1965	1970	*Projected* 1980	1990
Baltimore City	939,024	935,400	936,500	936,000	950,000
Allegany	84,169	84,500	83,500	84,000	85,000
Anne Arundel	206,634	248,000	282,500	356,800	409,300
Baltimore	492,428	588,600	680,600	889,600	996,700
Calvert	15,826	17,500	19,000	22,400	25,300
Caroline	19,462	19,500	19,700	20,200	20,500
Carroll	52,785	56,800	59,700	72,000	80,000
Cecil	48,408	55,700	62,500	80,500	91,000
Charles	32,572	37,200	41,700	53,400	63,500
Dorchester	29,666	30,400	30,700	32,900	34,000
Frederick	71,930	76,100	80,300	91,000	99,500
Garrett	20,420	20,100	20,100	20,400	20,600
Harford	76,722	91,800	108,400	136,000	162,000
Howard	36,152	42,200	81,200	143,200	161,000
Kent	15,481	16,300	17,200	18,800	20,100
Montgomery	340,928	415,600	499,500	621,000	714,000
Prince George's	357,395	433,200	520,300	638,000	755,000
Queen Anne's	16,569	17,300	18,000	19,600	20,900
St. Mary's	38,915	44,700	51,000	62,600	73,400
Somerset	19,623	19,100	18,700	19,100	19,400
Talbot	21,578	22,500	23,800	26,100	27,000
Washington	91,219	96,300	101,200	108,000	113,800
Wicomico	49,050	53,100	57,400	64,500	70,000
Worcester	23,733	24,100	24,500	25,400	26,000
TOTAL	3,100,689	3,446,000	3,838,000	4,541,500	5,038,000

Table 9—Acreage Required According to Standards—1965

Location	*City-County Intensive Areas*	*City-County Extensive Areas*	*State Intensive Areas*	*State Extensive Areas*	*Total*
			(acres)		
Baltimore City	4,677	4,677	.....	.....	9,354
Allegany	975	1,528	1,658	5,524	9,685
Anne Arundel	2,948	4,655	5,123	17,077	29,803
Baltimore	6,354	9,764	10,232	34,107	60,457
Calvert	305	523	653	2,174	3,655
Caroline	325	553	683	2,274	3,835
Carroll	1,036	1,787	2,255	7,517	12,595
Cecil	687	1,096	1,226	4,084	7,093
Charles	502	818	948	3,159	5,427
Dorchester	434	716	846	2,819	4,815
Frederick	891	1,402	1,532	5,104	8,929
Garrett	331	562	692	2,304	3,889
Harford	1,386	2,312	2,780	9,267	15,745
Howard	890	1,568	2,036	6,787	11,281
Kent	293	505	635	2,114	3,547
Montgomery	4,286	6,494	6,624	22,079	39,483
Prince George's	4,462	6,758	6,888	22,959	41,067
Queen Anne's	303	520	650	2,164	3,637
St. Mary's	577	931	1,061	3,534	6,103
Somerset	321	547	677	2,254	3,799
Talbot	355	598	728	2,424	4,105
Washington	1,093	1,705	1,835	6,114	10,747
Wicomico	681	1,057	1,187	3,954	6,879
Worcester	371	622	752	2,504	4,249
TOTAL	34,483	51,698	51,701	172,297	310,179

Table 10—Acreage Required According to Standards—1990

Location	*City-County Intensive Areas*	*City-County Extensive Areas*	*State Intensive Areas*	*State Extensive Areas*	*Total*
			(acres)		
Baltimore City	4,750	4,750	.....	.....	9,500
Allegany	982	1,489	1,671	5,569	9,711
Anne Arundel	4,568	7,090	7,565	25,215	44,438
Baltimore	10,432	15,900	16,375	54,585	97,292
Calvert	385	644	776	2,584	4,389
Caroline	337	572	704	2,344	3,957
Carroll	1,275	2,150	2,625	8,750	14,800
Cecil	1,042	1,629	1,761	5,869	10,301
Charles	767	1,217	1,349	4,494	7,827
Dorchester	472	774	906	3,019	5,171
Frederick	1,127	1,757	1,889	6,294	11,067
Garrett	338	573	705	2,349	3,965
Harford	2,095	3,380	3,855	12,850	22,180
Howard	2,085	3,365	3,840	12,800	22,090
Kent	333	566	698	2,324	3,921
Montgomery	7,272	10,974	11,106	37,019	66,371
Prince George's	7,682	11,589	11,721	39,069	70,061
Queen Anne's	341	578	710	2,364	3,993
St. Mary's	866	1,365	1,497	4,989	8,717
Somerset	326	555	687	2,289	3,857
Talbot	402	669	801	2,669	4,541
Washington	1,270	1,971	2,103	7,009	12,353
Wicomico	832	1,314	1,446	4,819	8,411
Worcester	392	654	786	2,619	4,451
TOTAL	50,371	75,525	75,576	251,892	453,364

Table 11

Current Acreage—Existing Public Facilities

Location	*City-County Intensive Areas*	*City-County Extensive Areas*	*State Intensive Areas*	*State Extensive Areas*	*Total*
			(acres)		
Baltimore City	2,346	2,473	.....	.....	4,819
Allegany	184	.....	24	37,591	37,799
Anne Arundel	157	21	238	814	1,230
Baltimore	4,138	18,638	587	5,103	28,466
Calvert	.....	.....	7	.....	7
Caroline	150	.....	33	700	883
Carroll	60	5,735	333	834	6,962
Cecil	13	.....	410	3,538	3,961
Charles	2	9	135	4,922	5,068
Dorchester	351	.....	3	11,286	11,640
Frederick	1,398	7,012	967	4,864	14,241
Garrett	4	.....	648	77,825	78,477
Harford	419	434	67	802	1,722
Howard	100	3,300	909	2,663	6,972
Kent	7	.....	41	561	609
Montgomery	6,124	5,010	28	1,066	12,228
Prince George's	2,047	1,827	77	1,368	5,319
Queen Anne's	94	.....	12	179	285
St. Mary's	22	18	7	60	107
Somerset	42	.....	3	15,407	15,452
Talbot	27	.....	5	2	34
Washington	198	15	209	6,184	6,606
Wicomico	282	63	.....	3,176	3,521
Worcester	80	12	83	14,287	14,462
TOTAL	18,245	44,567	4,826	193,232	260,870

Table 12—Deficiency—1965*

Location	*City-County Intensive Areas*	*City-County Extensive Areas*	*State Intensive Areas*	*State Extensive Areas*	*Total*
			(acres)		
Baltimore City	2,331	2,204	.....	.....	4,535
Allegany	791	1,528	1,634	32,067†	28,114†
Anne Arundel	2,791	4,634	4,885	16,263	28,573
Baltimore	2,216	8,874†	9,645	29,004	31,991
Calvert	305	523	646	2,174	3,648
Caroline	175	553	650	1,574	2,952
Carroll	976	3,948†	1,922	6,683	5,633
Cecil	674	1,096	816	546	3,132
Charles	500	809	813	1,763†	359
Dorchester	83	716	843	8,467†	6,825†
Frederick	507†	5,610†	565	240	5,312†
Garrett	327	562	44	75,521†	74,588†
Harford	967	1,878	2,713	8,465	14,023
Howard	790	1,732†	1,127	4,124	4,309
Kent	286	505	594	1,553	2,938
Montgomery	1,838†	1,484	6,596	21,013	27,255
Prince George's	2,415	4,931	6,811	21,591	35,748
Queen Anne's	209	520	638	1,985	3,352
St. Mary's	555	913	1,054	3,474	5,996
Somerset	279	547	674	13,153†	11,653†
Talbot	328	598	723	2,422	4,071
Washington	895	1,690	1,626	70†	4,141
Wicomico	399	994	1,187	778	3,358
Worcester	291	610	669	11,783†	10,213†
TOTAL	16,238	7,131	46,875	20,935†	49,309

* The difference between acreage needed in 1965 according to standards and acreage now available.
† Surplus.

Table 13—Deficiency—1990*

Location	*City-County Intensive Areas*	*City-County Extensive Areas*	*State Intensive Areas*	*State Extensive Areas*	*Total*
			(acres)		
Baltimore City	2,404	2,277	.....	.....	4,681
Allegany	798	1,489	1,647	32,022†	28,088†
Anne Arundel	4,411	7,069	7,327	24,401	43,208
Baltimore	6,294	2,738†	15,788	49,482	68,826
Calvert	385	644	769	2,584	4,382
Caroline	187	572	671	1,644	3,074
Carroll	1,215	3,585†	2,292	7,916	7,838
Cecil	1,029	1,629	1,351	2,331	6,340
Charles	765	1,208	1,214	428†	2,759
Dorchester	121	774	903	8,267†	6,469†
Frederick	271†	5,255†	922	1,430	3,174†
Garrett	334	573	57	75,476†	74,512†
Harford	1,676	2,946	3,788	12,048	20,458
Howard	1,985	65	2,931	10,137	15,118
Kent	326	566	657	1,763	3,312
Montgomery	1,148	5,964	11,078	35,953	54,143
Prince George's	5,635	9,762	11,644	37,701	64,742
Queen Anne's	247	578	698	2,185	3,708
St. Mary's	844	1,347	1,490	4,929	8,610
Somerset	284	555	684	13,118†	11,595†
Talbot	375	669	796	2,667	4,507
Washington	1,072	1,956	1,894	825	5,747
Wicomico	550	1,251	1,446	1,643	4,890
Worcester	312	642	703	11,668†	10,011†
TOTAL	32,126	30,958	70,750	58,660	192,494

* The difference between acreage needed in 1990 according to standards and acreage now available.
† Surplus.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR MEETING NEEDS

An action program is presented which will involve Federal, State, county, municipal, quasi-public, and private responsibilities for meeting outdoor recreation needs.

Federal

The Federal government has underway advanced planning for recreation area development in Maryland to be administered by four principal agencies: National Park Service and Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, both of the Department of the Interior; Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense; and Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture. The National Park Service has been authorized to proceed with land acquisition and facility development for Assateague Island National Seashore Park in Worcester County. The total cost of this project has been estimated at about $21 million. The National Park Service has prepared project proposals for a Potomac Valley Park (stretching from Washington, D. C., to Cumberland, Maryland) along both banks of the Potomac River. Approximately $100 million may be the recommended expenditure on that part of the Park which would be in Maryland (the Park also would lie in Virginia and West Virginia). This Park also would complete a project of the National Park Service already begun—the George Washington Memorial Parkway, extending from Washington, D. C., to Great Falls, Maryland.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife plans to acquire additional land on Eastern Neck Island in Kent County. This Island is an established National Migratory Bird Refuge, part of the chain of such waterfowl protection areas along the Atlantic Flyway. The cost of this acquisition has not yet been determined.

The Corps of Engineers has numerous projects scheduled which will directly and indirectly affect recreational area usage in Maryland. These include certain navigation and shore erosion projects, as well as construction of major water supply reservoirs. Of primary recreational importance are the water supply reservoirs. Three such reservoirs now have been recommended for construction wholly or partially in Maryland by 1990. These projects are Bloomington (Garrett County, initial construction cost $50.6 million), Town Creek (Allegany, $9.8 million), and Sideling Hill (Allegany, cost not yet determined). A fourth project, Seneca, (Montgomery and Frederick counties, initial construction cost $101.8 million) has been deferred pending further study.

The Soil Conservation Service also is constructing impoundments in Maryland, but for flood control purposes primarily. These are constructed under Public Law 566, which permits recreational use to be made of the impoundments. Two P.L. 566 impoundments with important recreational features are under construction in Montgomery County, and another is scheduled for Somerset County. The expenditure on such impoundments through 1990 has not yet been determined.

State

State programs for outdoor recreation facilities development are to be administered essentially by four agencies: the State departments of Forests and Parks, Chesapeake Bay Affairs, State Roads Commission, and Game and Inland Fish. The State Department of Forests and Parks (in cooperation with the State Planning Department and Governor's Master Plan Committee on State Parks) has drafted a 10-year land acquisition and facility development program. This program calls for acquisition and/or development at over 40 separate locations throughout Maryland, involving expenditures of approximately $70 million between 1967 and 1976.

The State Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs has a new waterway improvement program, financed by a boat titling tax. This fund will enable the expenditure of about $500,000 annually for channel improvement, public marina protection, and other waterway projects beneficial to recreational boating.

The State Roads Commission is formulating detailed plans for the development of scenic rest stops along Maryland's Interstate and Primary routes. Tentative plans call for the establishment of 16 scenic rest stops (of almost 10 acres each) along the Interstate system and numerous similar installations (of about 3-6 acres each) along the Primary system. The average cost of each scenic rest stop may reach $150,000, so that the entire program's cost may approach $5-10 million.

The State Roads Commission also has prepared cost estimates and preliminary plans for an initial scenic roads and parkways system throughout Maryland. This initial system comprises 13 routes totaling 540 miles, to require expenditures of about $240 million, or $450,000 per mile. The ultimate 1990 system recommended by the State Planning Department comprises 1,255 miles. If the cost figure of $450,000 per mile is applied to this mileage, the total cost for the ultimate system will approximate $555 million.

The Department of Game and Inland Fish has State revenues of about $200,000 annually which are programmed for use in land acquisition, pond construction, and other wildlife habitat improvement related to hunting and fishing. Their projects are well distributed throughout the State, although the public hunting lands acquisition program will be concentrated in more rural areas of Maryland in order for wildlife populations to be managed without serious disturbance from urbanization.

County and Municipal

The nearly 180 counties and municipalities of Maryland are undertaking a variety of outdoor recreation programs designed to meet local and regional needs. A dominant source of financing for many of them will be the Land and Water Conservation Fund. County and municipal allocations from the Fund have been determined by the Governor's Land and Water Conservation Fund Act Committee.

Land and Water Conservation Fund allocations to the entire State for fiscal years 1965 and 1966 will total $1,593,743.* The Governor's Committee has provided for a 10 per cent contingency fund, or $159,374 which will be available for projects of an emergency nature. In allocating the remaining $1,434,369 between the State and its political subdivisions, a 40-60 apportionment was used, paralleling that established by the Congress in dividing the Land and Water Conservation Fund nationally between the Federal government and the states. Thus, the State of Maryland will utilize $573,748 and its political subdivisions, $860,621.

In distributing the Fund among the political subdivisions, the Governor's Committee agreed upon a formula which includes current and projected population, percentage of population which is urbanized, and existing public, quasi-public, and private outdoor recreation acreage in each county and Baltimore City. The fund for fiscal years 1965 and 1966 was distributed as follows:

Baltimore City	$134,244
Allegany	31,731
Anne Arundel	56,138

* Maryland's total allocation for fiscal year 1966 is subject to change, depending on whether the Land and Water Conservation Fund receives revenue at projected levels. At present, the Fund is below expectations, and a decrease in each state's allocation may be necessary.

Baltimore	102,514
Calvert	14,645
Caroline	14,645
Carroll	20,747
Cecil	20,747
Charles	15,865
Dorchester	23,187
Frederick	25,628
Garrett	10,000
Harford	31,731
Howard	24,408
Kent	18,306
Montgomery	81,769
Prince George's	85,428
Queen Anne's	14,644
St. Mary's	25,628
Somerset	12,204
Talbot	25,628
Washington	31,731
Wicomico	26,849
Worcester	12,204
	$860,621

In order to assure that all allocated funds will be spent on projects, the following procedure was adopted. For the first two years following each annual appropriation, funds will be allocated to the counties and Baltimore City on the basis of the formula. At the beginning of the third year, those funds not yet spent in the political subdivisions will revert to the State for use on State projects.

Tables 12 and 13 indicate the basic deficiency in outdoor recreation areas in each county and Baltimore City. Individual projects must meet recreational needs as identified in these tables, with emphasis upon meeting 1965 needs first. The establishment of priorities for projects within each county or Baltimore City will be a function of a county or the City project review board, the appointment of which is the responsibility of the County Council or Board of Commissioners of each county and the Council of Baltimore City.

Quasi-Public and Private

The provision of increased outdoor recreation areas and facilities by quasi-public and private interests is highly important to the meeting of recreational needs in Maryland. While the State government cannot give complete direction to the programs of these non-governmental sectors, it can offer technical assistance and legislative aids that will encourage augmentation of quasi-public and private programs. Much technical assistance to such programs already is being given by field representatives of the State departments of Forests and Parks and Game and Inland Fish, the University of Maryland's Cooperative Extension Service, and also Federal agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service.

To improve the ability of quasi-public and private groups to serve Maryland's growing outdoor recreation demand, the State Rural Areas Development Committee has established a Recreation Sub-Committee. This Sub-Committee will seek to identify major problems associated with quasi-public and private outdoor recreation programs, and it will attempt to focus attention upon public forms of assistance to these programs.

FINANCING

Congressional appropriations under present and future Federal outdoor recreation programs will constitute the funding for Federal projects in Maryland. This funding has not yet been developed on a long-term basis, but will take shape gradually and be discussed in subsequent revisions of this Plan.

Much of this Maryland action program will be financed by appropriations and revenues from the State of Maryland and its political subdivisions. Definite financial arrangements and scheduling still are in process and will be discussed more fully in revisions of the Plan. However, tentative indications are that the State will utilize general obligation bonds for about $50 million of the proposed $70 million State Park program. Franchises, revenue bonds, and concession contracts are expected to yield a minimum of at least $5 million additionally. Of the waterway improvement program under the State Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs, the Maryland boat titling tax alone will provide up to $500,000 annually. The State Department of Game and Inland Fish will utilize about $200,000 annually for recreation capital improvements from its hunting and fishing license sales and its imposition of fines for violation of hunting and fishing laws. The State Roads Commission may utilize an undetermined portion of its ear-marked gasoline tax funds for its scenic rest stops and scenic roads and parkways.

The State of Maryland, and its political subdivisions will take full advantage of every grant or loan recreational development program available. These include programs authorized under the following Federal legislation:

(1) Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965
(2) Federal Water Project Recreation Act of 1965
(3) Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965
(4) Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
(5) Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965
(6) Highway Beautification Act of 1965
(7) Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965
(8) Water Quality Act of 1965
(9) Food and Agriculture Act of 1965
(10) Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1965
(11) Surplus Property Act of 1944
(12) Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1965
(13) Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937 (Pittman-Robertson)
(14) Fish Restoration Act of 1951 (Dingell-Johnson)
(15) Rivers and Harbors Act of 1962

In addition to those programs, quasi-public and private interests also may find financial assistance through the Maryland Development Credit Corporation and under Federal provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

The use of Land and Water Conservation Fund grants in Maryland will be based upon the recommendations of this interim plan and its subsequent revisions. Such use will begin immediately upon approval of the Plan by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and will seek to meet Maryland's outdoor recreation needs in accordance with assigned priorities for each section of the State and for major types of outdoor recreation areas.

General project priorities for county and municipal use of Land and Water

Conservation Fund money have been assigned on the basis of the formula devised by the Governor's Land and Water Conservation Fund Act Committee which distributed variable amounts of Maryland's total Fund allocation to the 23 counties and Baltimore City. Detailed project priorities will be set by each county's (and Baltimore City's) project review board—which will be broadly representative of county, municipal, and other outdoor recreation interests. These boards will decide on the specific county and municipal projects they wish to undertake, in conformance with the needs shown in Tables 12 and 13 of this report.

At present few Maryland counties and municipalities have completed local outdoor recreation plans; therefore, precise identification of future local projects throughout Maryland is not currently possible. However, such planning now is underway and will be incorporated into revisions of the State comprehensive outdoor recreation plan to further assist in the assignment of statewide priorities.

In the assignment of priorities for projects to be undertaken by State agencies, much planning has been completed relative to State Parks (administered by the State Department of Forests and Parks), and planning is in process for areas to be acquired and/or developed for purposes of hunting, fishing, and boating (under programs administered by the State Department of Game and Inland Fish and State Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs).

Table 14 shows the name, county of location, and relative priority of proposed State Park projects through 1976. Table 15 shows the areas for which land acquisition or impoundment construction is proposed by the Department of Game and Inland Fish to begin in Fiscal Year 1967, and also areas of possible project emphasis through 1976. Table 16 indicates the waterway improvement projects proposed by the Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs to begin in Fiscal Year 1967, and the areas of possible project emphasis through 1976. These listings are tentative, pending final administrative review and adoption by the General Assembly of Maryland. As more definite scheduling of State agency projects becomes feasible, the priorities established will be identified in revisions of this Plan.

Table 14

Proposed Maryland State Parks Priority Program
1967 - 1976

County of Location	*Total Acreage to be Acquired*	*Number of Parks for which Land will be Acquired*	*Number of Parks for which Development is Scheduled*
First Priority*			
Anne Arundel‡	4,655	4	2**
Baltimore and Harford	9,021	3	3
Calvert	1,100	1	1
Caroline and Queen Anne's	3,949	1	1
Charles and Prince George's	5,000	1	....
Cecil	850	1	1
Frederick	.....	....	1
Howard and Montgomery	9,720	2	2
St. Mary's	3	1	1
Somerset	.....	....	1
Washington	.....	....	1
Worcester	.....	....	1
Second Priority†			
Allegany	100	1	1
Caroline	.....	....	1
Carroll	1,000	1	....
Cecil	50	1	....
Charles and Prince George's	6,704	3	3
Dorchester	1,000	1	....
Frederick and Washington	1,065	2	4
Garrett	.....	....	3
Harford	951	2	1
Kent	1,000	1	....
Queen Anne's	1,500	1	....
St. Mary's	.....	....	1
Worcester	.....	....	1

* Projects to begin during Fiscal Years 1967-1971.
† Projects to begin during Fiscal Years 1972-1976.
‡ Excluding a multi-county stream valley project for which the acreage to be acquired is not definitely set; counties involved are Anne Arundel, Calvert, Charles, Howard, Montgomery, Prince George's, and St. Mary's.
**One of these projects is a major State historic restoration financed by the State of Maryland outside the State Park program.

Table 15

Proposed State Hunting and Fishing Area Priority Program, 1967 - 1976

County of Location	*Total Acreage to be Acquired*	*Number of Areas for which Land will be Acquired*	*Number of Impoundments Scheduled for Construction*
FIRST PRIORITY*			
Charles	1,500	1	....
Kent	1,938	1	....
Washington	1,568	1	1
Allegany	2,774	1	1
SECOND PRIORITY†			
Charles	‡	1	....
Washington	‡	1	....
Dorchester	‡	3	....
Wicomico	‡	2	....
Somerset	‡	4	....
Allegany	‡	1	....
Worcester	‡	2	....

* Projects to begin in Fiscal Year 1967.
† Projects to he undertaken as funds become available through 1976.
‡ Indefinite.

Table 16

Proposed Waterway Improvement Projects* Priority Program, 1967-1976

Location	*Number of Waterway Improvement Projects*
FIRST PRIORITY†	
Talbot	1
Caroline	1
SECOND PRIORITY‡	
Harford	1
Baltimore (County)	1
Baltimore (City)	1
Anne Arundel	1
Calvert	3
St. Mary's	6
Talbot and Caroline	3
Dorchester and Wicomico	4
Somerset	3
Worcester	2

* These projects typically will involve channel widening or deepening, jetty construction, removal of obstructions, and similar aids to boating.
† Projects to begin in Fiscal Year 1967.
‡ Projects to be undertaken as funds become available through 1976.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

Maryland is confronted with a number of special problems which, unless recognized, studied, and solved, will act to hinder recreational opportunity in the State in the future. These problems include:

1. The prohibiting of greater recreational use of the large water supply reservoirs located in proximity to urban centers;
2. The location of military bases on large tracts of prime potential outdoor recreation land and shoreline near urban centers, precluding public recreational use;
3. The limited recreational use of Chesapeake Bay because of pollution, sea nettles, seaweed, and preponderance of shoreline in private ownership;
4. The increasing encroachment of residential and other development along the Appalachian Trail;
5. The lack of public awareness of the value of significant remaining "natural areas," especially near cities; and
6. The need for outdoor recreation areas for handicapped persons.

Both Baltimore and the suburbs of Washington, D. C., are served by large water supply reservoirs located near the urban centers. North and west of Baltimore are located three large lakes—Patapsco (approximately 3,100 acres), Loch Raven (approximately 2,400 acres), and Prettyboy (approximately 1,500 acres). Some limited recreational use is permitted on parts of the adjoining land area, but the administering agency (Bureau of Water Supply, Baltimore City) restricts use of the water to fishing from electric-powered boats. Similarly, the two large lakes on the Patuxent River—Rocky Gorge (approximately 800 acres) and Triadelphia (approximately 800 acres)—are closed to many recreational activities by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, the agency in charge. The reason for the prohibiting of more extensive use of these areas, particularly the water itself, is supposedly that greater use would pollute the water which is consumed in Baltimore and the Washington suburbs. In other parts of the Nation, certain water supply reservoirs are used for such intensive uses as swimming and boating (with gasoline motors) with no harmful effects. These five large reservoirs in Maryland also might be used more intensively to help meet the mounting water-oriented recreation demand.

Several large military installations are located in close proximity to the State's major urban centers and along valuable portions of shoreline. Aberdeen Proving Ground, in Harford County, is the largest base in the State—30,475 acres of land, 7,500 acres of permanent wetlands, and 36,734 acres of water surface, or 74,509 acres in all. Adjacent to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Edgewood Arsenal comprises another 5,103 acres (2,929 acres of land, 1,725 acres of permanent wetlands, and 449 acres of water surface). Each of these installations is located within less than an hour of Baltimore and occupies nearly all of the undeveloped shoreline between Baltimore and the Susquehanna River.

Between Baltimore and Washington are located two more large tracts of military land. Fort George G. Meade, located midway between these two centers, covers an area of 13,539 acres bordering the Patuxent River, in Anne Arundel County. Although it has beneficially served to keep this land in an open character, its present

use precludes public enjoyment of its wooded expanse, meandering streams, and swamps. Located southeast of Washington, Andrews Air Force Base contains 4,377 acres of land. Most of the land is relatively flat and open, but occasional stretches of woods make the area attractive for field games, picnic areas, and campgrounds.

At some distance from both Baltimore and Washington, Patuxent Naval Air Station is located in St. Mary's County. The station, situated on a large flat tract at the confluence of the Patuxent River and Chesapeake Bay, covers an area of 8,547 acres. Much of the land fronts either on the Bay or the River, usurping much shoreline which might be put to recreational use if available.

Recreational use of Chesapeake Bay has been limited markedly because of the occurrence of pollutants, sea nettles, and seaweed, as well as by the absence of publicly-owned land. Although the Bay is bounded by a shoreline in excess of 3,200 miles length, little recreational use may be made of most of it because of these problems. Pollution, especially heavy in the area around Baltimore due to disposal of industrial wastes, acts to restrict swimming in much of the northern Bay. After late July, only small portions of the Bay are fit for swimming because of the appearance of the sea nettle—a jellyfish whose sting causes severe pain. Throughout the summer months in most sections of the Bay, the water is clogged by masses of eurasian milfoil—a thick matted seaweed which spells death for fish and seriously impedes use of the waters by people. Should each of these biological-ecological problems be combated at least in part, the State still would be faced with the problem of lack of public access to much of the Bay. Several State Parks lie on shores of the Bay—Elk Neck, Gunpowder, Sandy Point, and Point Lookout; others are programmed for acquisition and development during the next decade—Rhode River, Calvert Cliffs, Wye Island, and Jane's Island. A few city and county parks also have been and will be placed along the Bay.

The Appalachian Trail, traversing through Maryland 37 of its 2,000-plus miles is vulnerable to despoilation by encroaching residential and other land uses. Interruption of the Trail by an impinging land use would force relocation. Such a change in location would be of considerable difficulty and would have far-reaching detrimental effects, because in Maryland the Trail follows the crest of South Mountain, the only truly high mountain range east of Allegany and Garrett counties. Disturbance of the existing location would necessitate development of a new trail some fifty miles west with necessary realignment in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia.

Unfortunately, there is considerable apathy among the public, in general, and on the part of many key public officials in particular, concerning the perceived value of significant "natural areas." The value of these areas, particularly those near urban centers where natural areas are fast disappearing, is little understood. These areas of prime botanical, ecological, geological, historical, and archaeological significance cannot be preserved until a keener awareness of their values has been created.

Although most of our people are able to seek outdoor recreation anywhere they wish, a substantial number of Maryland citizens—because of mental or physical handicaps—are confronted with but limited recreational opportunities. For these less fortunate Marylanders, the State must provide more adequate areas and facilities. At present, mental hospitals, schools for the deaf and the blind, leagues for crippled children and adults, tuberculosis sanitoria, and corrective institutions provide few facilities for outdoor recreational use (generally ball fields and camps). In addition to efforts by government, a number of quasi-public agencies have sought to share this responsibility by introducing special programs for handicapped persons.

3 1430 02900612 1

a31430029006121b
UNIV. OF MD. COLLEGE PARK

DO NOT CIRCULATE

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND LIBRARY